



State of Alaska
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
Environmental Evaluation
**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORM
FOR HIGHWAY PROJECTS**

Project Name: Saint Mary's - Pitka's Point Dust Control
Project Number (state/federal): 63788 / DC-01257-00
Date: 5/31/11
CE Designation: 23 CFR 771.117(d)(1)
List of Attachments: Location Map
Project plan and typical

I. Project Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to provide road surfacing improvements to Saint Mary's Airport Road and Pitka's Point Road. These rural roads are in need of new surfacing material and application of dust palliative to reduce dust from vehicle traffic.

II. Project Description

Approximately five miles of Airport Road (from Saint Mary's to the airport) and 1.5 miles of Pitka's Point Road (from Airport Road to Pitka's Point) will be graded, shaped, and have up to one foot of crushed aggregate material added to the surface. Crushed aggregate for the project will be acquired from a local commercial source. Calcium chloride will be applied to the new surfacing material as a dust palliative. Road surfacing improvements will all occur within the existing embankment, with no expansion of the roadway footprint. Hand clearing of brush may occur along some road segments of the project area.

III. Environmental Consequences

Complete the following. For each yes, summarize the activity evaluated, the magnitude of the impact and the potential for significant impact based on context and intensity. An alternatives analysis (e.g. Avoidance and Minimization Checklist) is required for any consequence category with an asterisk (). Attach analysis as appropriate.*

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1. Additional right-of-way required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Permanent easements required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estimated number of parcels: _____			
b. Full or partial property acquisition required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estimated number of full parcels: _____			
Estimated number of partial parcels: _____			
c. Property transfer from state or federal agency required. <i>If yes, list agency in No. 4 below.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Business or residential relocations required. <i>If yes, summarize the findings of the conceptual stage relocation study in No. 4 below and attach the conceptual stage relocation study.</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> *	<input type="checkbox"/>
No. of relocations: _____			
Type of relocation: Residential: <input type="checkbox"/> Business: <input type="checkbox"/>			
Residential (Indicate number: _____)			
Business (Indicate number: _____)			
e. Last-resort housing required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

E. Impacts to Historic Properties

N/A YES NO

2. Is a National Register listed or eligible property in the Area of Potential Effect?
3. Date Consultation/Initiation Letters sent N/A Attach copies to this form. If no letters sent explain why not.
4. Date "Finding of Effect" Letters sent N/A Attach copies to this form.
5. Date SHPO concurred with "Finding of Effect" N/A Attach letter or email from SHPO to this form.
6. Will there be an adverse effect on a historic property? If yes, attach correspondence and signed MOA. If yes, Programmatic Agreements (PCE) do not apply. ☒ ☐ ☐
7. Summarize affects to historic properties.
Project work is consistent with Chief Engineer's Directive of July 7, 2010 'Program Undertakings with No Potential to Cause Effects to Historic Properties' as well as activities covered by the May 2, 2006 'No Potential' memo.

F. Wetland Impacts

N/A YES NO

1. Project involves wetlands as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If yes, document public and agency coordination required per E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands. ☐ ☐* ☒
2. Wetlands delineated in accordance with the "Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Alaska Region (Version 2.0) Sept. 2007". ☒ ☐ ☐
3. Estimated area of involvement (i.e. acres): 0
4. Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): 0
5. Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): 0 ☐ ☒
6. USACE authorization anticipated?
If yes, type: NWP ☐ Individual ☐ GP ☐ Other ☐
7. Summarize wetlands impacts and attach following supporting documentation as appropriate:
- Avoidance and Minimization Checklist.
 - Wetlands Delineation.
 - Jurisdictional Determination.
 - Copies of public and resource agency letters received in response to the request for comments.

Wetlands impacts are as follows:

8. Wetlands Finding:

- a. Are there practicable alternatives to the proposed construction in wetlands? If yes, the project cannot be approved as proposed. ☒ ☐ ☐
- b. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands? If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed. List any commitments and mitigative measures in Section VIII. ☒ ☐ ☐
- c. Only practicable alternative: Based on the evaluation of avoidance and minimization alternatives, there are no practicable alternatives that would ☒ ☐ ☐

H. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)

N/A YES NO

5. Project is likely to adversely affect a listed T&E species or critical habitat. *If yes, formal Section 7 consultation is required, and the project may not be assigned to the State per SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 and the CE must be sent to FHWA for approval.*
6. Summarize the findings of the biological assessment and the biological opinion of the agency with jurisdiction.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No T&E species present in project area, and scope of work limited to minor improvements to existing roadway.

I. Water Body Involvement

N/A YES NO

1. Project affects a water body.
2. Project affects a navigable water body as defined by USCG, (i.e. Section 9).
3. Project affects Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE, Section 404.
4. Project affects Navigable Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE, Section 10.
5. Project affects a resident fish stream (i.e. A.S. 16.14.841)
6. Project affects a cataloged anadromous fish stream (i.e. A.S. 16.14.871).
7. Project affects a designated Wild and Scenic River or land adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River. *If yes, the Regional Environmental Manager should consult with the Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004 (assigned CEs) or FHWA Area Engineer (non-assigned CEs) to determine applicability of Section 4(f).*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

8. Proposed river or stream involvement: Bridge ☐ Culvert ☐ Embankment Fill ☐
Relocation ☐ Diversion ☐ Temporary ☐ Permanent ☐ N/A ☒

9. Type of stream or river habitat impacted: Spawning ☐ Rearing ☐ Pool ☐ Riffle ☐
Undercut bank ☐ N/A ☒

10. Amount of fill below: OHW 0 MHW 0 HTL 0

11. Summarize impacts:

No effects to water bodies from this dust control project.

J. Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP)

N/A YES NO

1. Project is within the Alaska Coastal Management Program boundary.
2. Project is within a local coastal management district. *If yes, consult with the local coastal management official and attach correspondence.*
3. Project is consistent with local and state coastal management plans. *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*
4. Finding:

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Project area is not within a coastal zone.

K. Hazardous Waste (HW)

N/A YES NO

1. There are known or potentially contaminated sites along the corridor.
2. The existing and/or proposed ROW is contaminated.
3. Extensive excavation is proposed adjacent to, or within, a known HW site.
4. Potential for encountering hazardous waste during construction is high.
5. Summarize impacts of any 'yes' marked in 1-4 and attach appropriate HW investigation report.
- DEC contaminated sites database checked 5/17/11, no open sites located within project area.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

L. Air Quality (Conformity)

N/A YES NO

1. The project is located in an air quality maintenance area or nonattainment area (CO or PM-10). *If yes, indicate CO ☐ or PM-10 ☐ and complete the remainder of this*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

N. Noise Impacts (23 CFR Part 772)**N/A** **YES** **NO**

attach the noise analysis, if applicable (see 2). If no, go to section O.

Category A: There are adjacent lands where serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.

☒ ☐ ☐

Category B: There are adjacent picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, hotels, motels, schools, churches, libraries, or hospitals.

☒ ☐ ☐

Category C: There are adjacent developed lands, properties, or activities not included in categories A or B above. This would include commercial properties.

☒ ☐ ☐

2. The project is located on new location and would result in substantial changes in vertical or horizontal alignment, or would increase the number of through lanes. If yes, a noise analysis is required. If not, go to Section O.

☒ ☐ ☐

3. There is an existing noise impact.

☒ ☐ ☐

4. The project would create a noise impact.

☒ ☐ ☐

5. Noise analysis demonstrates potential noise impacts.

☒ ☐ ☐

6. There are feasible and reasonable measures that can reduce noise impacts (attach analysis).

☒ ☐ ☐

7. The noise abatement measures listed in 23 CFR 772.13(c)(1-5) have been considered for those receivers where a noise impact would occur.

☒ ☐ ☐

8. Summarize noise impact and abatement measures considered, if applicable.

Dust control project will not result in noise impacts.

O. Water Quality Impacts**N/A** **YES** **NO**

1. Project would involve a public or private drinking source. If yes, explain in no. 7.

☐ ☐ ☒

2. Project would result in a discharge of storm water to a Waters of the U.S.

☐ ☐ ☒

3. Project would discharge storm water into or affect an ADEC designated impaired water body. If yes, list in no. 4 and describe in no. 7.

☐ ☐ ☒

4. List name(s) and location(s).

5. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project?
≤1 acres

6. Is there a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) NPDES permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an NPDES permitted industrial facility? If yes, NPDES permit #: _____

☐ ☐ ☒

7. Summarize the impacts of any "yes" marked in Section O.

Project will not have water quality impacts; dust control may improve water quality along project area. Dust palliative application will approximately one half mile from the village of Saint Mary's in order avoid proximity to a drinking water source.

P. Construction Impacts**N/A** **YES** **NO**

1. There will be temporary degradation of water quality.

☐ ☐ ☒

2. There will be temporary stream diversion.

☐ ☐ ☒

3. There will be temporary degradation of air quality.

☐ ☒ ☐

4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.

☐ ☒ ☐

V. Comments and Coordination

N/A YES NO

correspondence that demonstrates coordination and that there are no unresolved issues.

Given the routine and limited scope of project work, no public or agency involvement was initiated.

VI. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

List the environmental commitments or mitigation measures included in the project.

BMPs will be employed to minimize risk of spilling construction-related materials.

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval

YES NO

1. The project meets the criteria of a Department or FHWA programmatic agreement. *If yes, the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager but needs a QA/QC check (see shaded block).* ☒* ☐
2. The State has determined that the project has no significant impacts on the environment and that the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under NEPA. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and the MOU dated September 22, 2009 executed between the FHWA and the State. *If yes, the CE may be approved by a Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004. If no, the CE must be approved by FHWA.* ☐ ☒

Prepared by: Brett D Nelson

Date: 5/31/11

Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by: [Signature]

Date: 5/31/11

Engineering Manager

Approved by: [Signature]

Date: 5/31/11

Regional Environmental Manager

If Assigned CE

Approved by: _____

Date: _____

[Print] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004

[Signature] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004

If Non-Assigned CE

Approved by: [Signature]

Date: 6/6/11


FHWA Area Engineer *Derali Commission*

If the CE meets the conditions of either the Internal Programmatic Agreement (DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004) or the Project Specific Agreement (DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004), the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager but needs a QA/QC check (see shaded block).

Concurrence by: _____

Date: _____

DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager or FHWA Area Engineer



LEGEND

— PALLIATIVE APPLICATION APPROX 6.4 MILES

STATE OF ALASKA

Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
Maintenance & Operations
Northern Region

SHEET:	1 OF 2	SAINT MARYS - PITKA'S POINT DUST CONTROL PLAN
DATE:	MAY 2011	
PROJ NO:		